

Date: Mon, 3 Jan 94 04:30:15 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #562
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 3 Jan 94 Volume 93 : Issue 562

Today's Topics:

 Spirit of radio... (2 msgs)
 The 10-meters band - No CW required ? (4 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sun, 02 Jan 94 13:16:49 PST
From: netcomsv!netcomsv!rgm!espuma!chuck@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Spirit of radio...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

trd54583@uxa.cso.uiuc.edu (Cynops pyrrhogaster) writes:

> dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:
>
> >I know people that have got on the air for under \$5. (The cost of the
> >testing session.)
>
> Yeah, but most people have to shell out money for equipment (or parts if
> they wanna build stuff). Ham equipment seems to be harder to come by than
> FM radio...
>
> /lw

Not too much, the FCC recently opened 8 channels for public use at
455 MHz, these have a 2 mile transmission range. That is very close to the

442-444 HAM Band, so anyone wanting a cheap way to get onto the HAM band once they have their license could one of these radios that are exclusively made by Maxon, and easily modify them to use the HAM band at 442-444 MHz, this could be done by anyone competent in electronics. Most catalogs advertise this particular radio for about \$50.

Date: Mon, 03 Jan 94 02:01:14 EST
From: usc!math.ohio-state.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Spirit of radio...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

trd54583@uxa.cso.uiuc.edu (Cynops pyrrhogaster) writes:

> dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:
>
> >I know people that have got on the air for under \$5. (The cost of the
> >testing session.)
>
> Yeah, but most people have to shell out money for equipment (or parts if
> they wanna build stuff). Ham equipment seems to be harder to come by than
> FM radio...
>
Not around here.

And are FM radio's free where you live? Can I get a few? Besides I bet that your pirate FM transmitter could work on SOME ham band. So the equipment issue is really a blind. You say that pirate radio operators can equip themselves for 'broadcasting' but could not find equipment for ham radio? Thin, very thin. (Damn near invisible!)

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV / dan@mystis.wariat.org / ac447@po.cwru.edu

Moving parts in rubbing contact require lubrication to avoid excess wear. Honorifics and formal politeness provide lubrication where people rub together. Often the very young, the naive, the unsophisticated deplore these formalities as "empty", "Meaningless", "Dishonest", and scorn to use them. No matter how "pure" their motives, they throw sand into machinery that does not work too well at best. -L. Long

Date: Sun, 2 Jan 1994 11:18:20 GMT
From: swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo!sugar!rcoyle@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <940102.02501.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, Ed Ellers <EDELLERS@delphi.com> writes:

> Normally I wouldn't reply to your garbage, but since you asked me the response
> is that I never had any intention of getting a Commercial Radiotelegraph
> Operator's License since I never had any intention of working in a position
> that required one. (If you read the rules closely enough you would have seen
> that such a license should only be applied for if actually needed.) Therefore
> the question is irrelevant.

No Ed, the question IS relevant. I invite you to investigate the written element for the Second Class Radiotelegraph (since you shun Morse so much). Anyone successfully passing that can run rings around a Codeless Technician (much less an Advanced or Extra).

--Robert

--

Date: Sun, 2 Jan 1994 21:20:08 GMT
From: psinntp!uuneo!sugar!rcoyle@uunet.uu.net
Subject: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jan2.172309.19454@CSD-NewsHost.Stanford.EDU>, kaufman@Xenon.Stanford.EDU (Marc T. Kaufman) writes:

> In article <CJ022L.Lss@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> rcoyle@NeoSoft.com (Robert Coyle) writes:

> >In article <940102.02501.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, Ed Ellers <EDELLERS@delphi.com> writes:

> >> Normally I wouldn't reply to your garbage, but since you asked me the response
> >> is that I never had any intention of getting a Commercial Radiotelegraph
> >> Operator's License since I never had any intention of working in a position
> >> that required one. (If you read the rules closely enough you would have seen
> >> that such a license should only be applied for if actually needed.)

Therefore

> >> the question is irrelevant.

>

> >No Ed, the question IS relevant. I invite you to investigate the written
> >element for the Second Class Radiotelegraph (since you shun Morse so
> >much). Anyone successfully passing that can run rings around a Codeless
> >Technician (much less an Advanced or Extra).

>

> Well, I passed the test for a First Class Radiotelephone license (I didn't
> plan to work on a ship, so didn't need the Radiotelegraph license). I also

> have an Amateur Extra. So what? I don't see how any of that affects the
I wonder if Ed Ellers can say the same?

> ability of a Codeless Tech to have fun and contribute to the growth of
> amateur radio. The CW only folks contribute about as much to amateur radio

One man's fun is another man's Citizen's Band. Just witness what's
happened to Two Meters.

--Robert
--

Date: Mon, 03 Jan 94 01:58:29 EST
From: usc!math.ohio-state.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

rcoyle@NeoSoft.com (Robert Coyle) writes:

> In article <940101.76385.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, Ed Ellers <EDELLERS@delphi.com
> > "...and as someone licensed since 1963 who has passed a Morse test in front
> > the by God FCC, I'm sick of your crap."
>
> So did I, but for my commercial ticket. Can you say the same, Ed?
>
> --Robert
> --

Robert, Ed was going out of his way to quote Gary AT YOUR request. Then
in the same message (you didn't quote that part) said that he hadn't. I
was hoping that your messages might be becoming more reasoned instead of
pure flame. I hope that the former is correct as this represents the
latter.

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV / dan@mystis.wariat.org / ac447@po.cwru.edu

Moving parts in rubbing contact require lubrication to avoid excess wear.
Honorifics and formal politeness provide lubrication where people rub
together. Often the very young, the naive, the unsophisticated deplore
these formalities as "empty", "Meaningless", "Dishonest", and scorn to
use them. No matter how "pure" their motives, they throw sand into
machinery that does not work too well at best. -L. Long

Date: Mon, 03 Jan 94 01:31:36 EST
From: sdd.hp.com!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

rcoyle@NeoSoft.com (Robert Coyle) writes:

> But such superior RF knowledge was not the product of passing the current
> written elements for an amateur license. Welfare crap? Yes, I think that
> is relevant to amateur radio. The welfare state is a society that believes
> a person should receive the rewards of working for something, without
> actually working for it. One of the chief fuels for this mentality is
> so-called "discrimination." The Blacks scream about how bad it was a
> century ago, so they get welfare and Affirmative Action. The Mexicans
> bitch that they shouldn't have to learn English, so we now have
> taxpayer-supported bi-lingual education for illegal aliens. The
> handicapped claimed that they just couldn't handle Morse, so now we have
> a physician's waiver of that element, just for them. The CBers didn't want
> to put forth the effort to learn anything

But Robert, you miss the point. The reason for CB (all classes of it)
are to allow any 'citizen' to have access to radio communications. As
far as I see it, that should mean 'personal' communications. Like 'Honey
I will be late, got stuck in traffic...' What class D became is, simply
put a travesty. But sending in a license and a fee is all the
'qualifications' that should be required. (Check out class A CB
sometime. It is a whole 'nother story.)

> (memorizing a question pool accomplishes little),

But one should then know the answers to the questions. SOMEHTING is
gained. Albiet less than should.

> so now we have the Codeless Technician license.

And that class is appropiate. There is very limited use for morse
encription above 50 Mhz. Even in amateur radio (read 40 years behind the
world and counting).

> Perhaps if YOU whine to the government, they'll give you a free ride, too.

Again, you miss the point. Neither Gary (that I have seen) or I have
suggested 'giving' away anything. Just making the requirements RELEVANT
to the privileges being offered (and/or the nature of the service).

Want to co-sponsor a proposal to add 50% more questions to the pool

based on Rules/Safety? I bet Gary and I will sign on. Maybe we could even come up with the questions (here on .policy).

And if you think anyone can memorize sufficiently large question pools you are mistaken. I 'can' memorize the current question pools. It would be tough but I could. However I happen to have a keen interest in learning the material behind the questions, so I don't want to memorize them. However, most average 'CBers' that you complain about don't have the intellect to 'memorize' the pools.

When one MEMORIZES the 40 odd characters in the morse alphabet one learns little usefull outside AMATEUR HF. At least saftey and electronic principles are usefull in the real world.

Instead of 'whining' about the problem, why not help become part of the solution. It takes more time and is harder, but the results are worth the effort. IF you are willing to work for something and put forth effort! Of course you could just sit there and expect good spectrum to be handed to you by the paternalistic government in Washington. After all they look out for the 'welfare' of those that just sit and watch.

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV / dan@mystis.wariat.org / ac447@po.cwru.edu

Moving parts in rubbing contact require lubrication to avoid excess wear. Honorifics and formal politeness provide lubrication where people rub together. Often the very young, the naive, the unsophisticated deplore these formalities as "empty", "Meaningless", "Dishonest", and scorn to use them. No matter how "pure" their motives, they throw sand into machinery that does not work too well at best. -L. Long

Date: Sun, 2 Jan 1994 18:26:57 GMT
From: swrinde!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec28.184600.4067@es.dupont.com>,
<1994Jan1.144130.8140@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <CIz0Ay.13r@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <CIz0Ay.13r@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> rcoyle@NeoSoft.com (Robert Coyle) writes:

>
>But such superior RF knowledge was not the product of passing the current
>written elements for an amateur license.

Now that's a true statement. But that's because the exam isn't supposed to certify you as a EE. It's supposed to see if you know enough to avoid injuring yourself or others, or interfering with others through use of radio. It's an *entrance* exam, not a graduation certificate. You're supposed to gain that extensive RF knowledge during your lifelong *learning by doing* in amateur radio. That's what self-training is all about. I don't think the current exams even live up to that standard, but that's a separate issue. The Morse exam certainly does nothing toward that goal.

>Welfare crap? Yes, I think that
>is relevant to amateur radio. The welfare state is a society that believes
>a person should receive the rewards of working for something, without
>actually working for it.

That's a (somewhat) fair assessment of the welfare mentality. You on the other hand aren't a welfare stater, you're just a statist. You think that you have to "work" for "rewards" from your *master* the government. Thomas Jefferson would not be amused. The government's legitimate role in amateur regulation is to assure, as best is possible, that access to the hands-on learning possibilities of amateur radio is available to anyone with a desire to learn, and a minimum demonstrated competence to take advantage of that learning opportunity without causing harm.

The spectrum is a commons, unowned by anyone, but shared by everyone. It doesn't belong to the government, so the government can't grant it to you for "work" you do, nor can it arbitrarily limit public access to *the public's airwaves* except in order to minimize conflicts in usage. The government is responsible, as the agent of the people, to regulate it's use in such a way that it isn't misused to the detriment of everyone. The Communications Act of 1934 says it best when it says in section 1 that the government's duty is "For the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in communications by wire and radio so as to make available, so far as possible, to *all* [emphasis mine] the people of the United States, a rapid, efficient, nationwide and worldwide wire and radio communications service..." Nothing in there about granting "priviledges" as "rewards" for "work". But then in 1934 Congress may have had a better sense of their status as *servants* of the people rather than *masters*.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Sun, 2 Jan 1994 17:23:09 GMT
From: library.ucla.edu!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!CSD-NewsHost.Stanford.EDU!
Xenon.Stanford.EDU!kaufman@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec25.214654.5428@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,
<940102.02501.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, <CJ022L.Lss@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>u
Subject : Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <CJ022L.Lss@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> rcoyle@NeoSoft.com (Robert Coyle)
writes:
>In article <940102.02501.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, Ed Ellers <EDELLERS@delphi.com>
writes:
>> Normally I wouldn't reply to your garbage, but since you asked me the response
>> is that I never had any intention of getting a Commercial Radiotelegraph
>> Operator's License since I never had any intention of working in a position
>> that required one. (If you read the rules closely enough you would have seen
>> that such a license should only be applied for if actually needed.) Therefore
>> the question is irrelevant.

>No Ed, the question IS relevant. I invite you to investigate the written
>element for the Second Class Radiotelegraph (since you shun Morse so
>much). Anyone successfully passing that can run rings around a Codeless
>Technician (much less an Advanced or Extra).

Well, I passed the test for a First Class Radiotelephone license (I didn't
plan to work on a ship, so didn't need the Radiotelegraph license). I also
have an Amateur Extra. So what? I don't see how any of that affects the
ability of a Codeless Tech to have fun and contribute to the growth of
amateur radio. The CW only folks contribute about as much to amateur radio
as the Model T club does to automotive engineering. I wouldn't begrudge
either group their enjoyment of their particular hobby, but that doesn't make
all other aspects of the hobby inferior.

I suppose next you'll be telling us that the radio spectrum should be open
only to those who have exhibited high moral behavior by taking Jesus as their
personal savior. Bah!

Date: Sun, 2 Jan 94 15:39:20 EST
From: noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec25.214654.5428@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,
<940102.02501.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, <CJ022L.Lss@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>
Subject : Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

Very true; the Second Class exam (whether 'phone or 'graph) was a lot tougher than a Tech exam. But since I never said that we shouldn't tighten up the RELEVANT requirements for an amateur license, my argument stands.

-- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #562

